

### REMARKS

The Office Action dated January 27, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The following amendments to the claims and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 13, 21 and 22 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the element of allowable claim 5. Claim 5 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added, and no new issues are raised which require further consideration and/or search. Claims 1-4 and 6-22 are therefore submitted for consideration.

The Office Action stated that claims 3-14, 21 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 3-14, 21 and 22. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 21 and 22 have been placed in independent form. Claims 6, 11, 12 and 14 are each dependent on an allowable independent claim. Therefore, Applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,864,708 to Croft et al. Claim 1 is allowable claim 5 in independent form. As noted on page 4 of the Office Action, claim 1 is now allowable over the prior art of record because it recites a feature that the prior art of record does not teach. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under

35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn because Croft et al. fails to teach or suggest each feature of claim 1 and hence, dependent claims 2, 17 and 20 thereon.

Claims 15, 16, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croft et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,864,708 to Anderson. Claims 15, 16, 18 and 19 are dependent on claim 1 which recites at least one feature that is not disclosed in the prior art. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Croft et al. nor Anderson, whether taken singly or combined, teaches or suggests each feature of claim 1 and hence, dependent claims 15, 16, 18 and 19 thereon.

As noted previously, claims 1-4 and 6-22 recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art references cited in the Office Action. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-4 and 6-22 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Arlene P. Neal  
Registration No. 43,828

**Customer No. 32294**  
**SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP**  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

APN:mm